UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,124	10/16/2003	Richard E. Fackenthal	ITL.1046US (P17448)	7345

21906	7590	06/28/2007

TROP PRUNER & HU, PC
1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750
HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2007

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (37 CFR 41.37)	Application No. 10/687,124	Applicant(s) FACKENTHAL, RICHARD E.	
	Examiner Guy J. Lamarre	Art Unit 2112	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on <u>22 February 2007</u> is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 41.37.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file an amended brief or other appropriate correction (see MPEP 1205.03) within **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer. **EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.**

1. ☐ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.

2. ☐ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).

3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).

4. ☒ (a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).

5. ☐ The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi))

6. ☐ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).

7. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).

8. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner **and relied upon by appellant in the appeal**, along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).

9. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(x)).

10. ☒ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

> *See Continuation Sheet.*

Guy J. Lamarre, P.E.
Primary Examiner
6/24/07

Continuation of 10. Other (including any explanation in support of the above items): For example, claim 38, the limitations:
a memory (Figure I, 140) coupled to said processor; and

a controller (Figure 1,150) coupled to said memory to selectively store data in
said memory at different densities per cell (Figure 5, 230) (specification at page 8, line 16 to page 9, line 11) and to implement error correction depending on a density of data storage (Figure 5, 240) (specification at page 7, line 25 to page 8, line 6),
are not concise because the recited controller 150 is not coupled to the memory 140 as alleged. See Fig. 1 for further clarification.